arXiv:1206.6139v1 [math.NT] 26 Jun 2012

A DENSITY VERSION OF THE VINOGRADOV THREE PRIME THEOREM

XUANCHENG SHAO

Abstract. We prove that if A is a subset of the primes, and the lower density of A in the primes is larger than $5/8$, then all sufficiently large odd positive integers can be written as the sum of three primes in A. The constant $5/8$ in this statement is the best possible.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we study the classical problem of writing a positive integer as sum of primes. The famous Goldbach conjecture says that every even positive integer at least 4 is the sum of two primes. This problem is considered to be out of the scope of current techniques. However, the ternary Goldbach problem of writing positive integers as sums of three primes is much more tractable. In 1937, Vinogradov [5] proved that all sufficiently large odd positive integers can be written as sums of three primes. Subsequent works have been done to refine what "sufficiently large" means. See [3] for a recent result and the history in this regard.

The purpose of this paper is to prove a density version of the Vinogradov's three prime theorem. More precisely, let $\mathcal{P}$ be the set of all primes. For a subset $A \subset \mathcal{P}$, the lower density of A in $\mathcal{P}$ is defined by

$$\underline{\delta}(A) = \liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{|A \cap [1,N]|}{|\mathcal{P} \cap [1,N]|}.$$

We would like to show that all sufficiently large odd positive integers can be written as sums of three primes in A, provided that $\underline{\delta}(A)$ is larger than a certain threshold.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $A \subset \mathcal{P}$ be a subset of the primes with $\underline{\delta}(A) > 5/8$. Then for a sufficiently large odd positive integer N, there exist $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A$ with $N = a_1 + a_2 + a_3$.*

The constant $5/8$ in Theorem 1.1 cannot be improved. In fact, we may take

$$A = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \equiv 1, 2, 4, 7, 13 \bmod 15\}.$$

Then $\underline{\delta} = 5/8$. It is not hard to see that if $N \equiv 14 \pmod{15}$ then N cannot be written as sum of three elements of A.

Our study of this problem is motivated by the work of Li and Pan [4]. They proved the following asymmetric version of Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 1.2. *Let $A_1, A_2, A_3 \subset \mathcal{P}$ be three subsets of the primes with $\underline{\delta}(A_1) + \underline{\delta}(A_2) + \underline{\delta}(A_3) > 2$. Then for a sufficiently large odd positive integer N, there exists $a_i \in A_i$ $(i = 1, 2, 3)$ with $N = a_1 + a_2 + a_3$.*

Their result is sharp in two different ways. One can either take $A_1 = A_2 = \mathcal{P}$ and $A_3 = \emptyset$, or take $A_1 = \mathcal{P}$ and $A_2 = A_3 = \{p \in \mathcal{P} : p \equiv 1(\bmod 3)\}$. Note that in these two examples, the three sets A_1, A_2, A_3 are very distinct from each other. Theorem 1.2 immediately implies a weaker version of Theorem 1.1, with 5/8 replaced by 2/3.

Our approach to Theorem 1.1 is similar to the treatment of Theorem 1.2 in [4]. The proof has two parts. The first part is to prove that there are no local obstructions, and the second part is to use the so-called "transference principle" in additive combinatorics, which was used to solve many other problems of similar nature (for example, see [1] and [2] for the proof of Roth's theorem in the primes). The main innovation of this paper is the first part of the proof, which asserts that $A+A+A = \{a_1+a_2+a_3 : a_1, a_2, a_3 \in A\}$ must cover all residue classes modulo m for any odd m, provided that the density of A in $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$ is greater than 5/8. The precise statement is as follows.

Proposition 1.3. *Let m be an odd squarefree positive integer. Let $f : \mathbb{Z}_m^* \to [0,1]$ be an arbitrary function with average larger than $5/8$:*

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^*} f(x) > \tfrac{5}{8}\phi(m).$$

Then for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, there exists $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_m^*$ with $x = a+b+c$, such that

$$f(a)f(b)f(c) > 0, \quad f(a)+f(b)+f(c) > \tfrac{3}{2}.$$

In particular, we have:

Corollary 1.4. *Let m be an odd squarefree positive integer. Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}_m^*$ be a subset with $|A| > \frac{5}{8}\phi(m)$. Then $A+A+A = \mathbb{Z}_m$.*

Note that the constant 3/2 in Proposition 1.3 cannot be made any larger. In fact, we may take $m = 3$ and $f(1) = 1$, $f(2) = 1/4$. Then for $x = 2$, we must have $(a,b,c) = (1,2,2)$, and thus $f(a)+f(b)+f(c) = 3/2$.

We remark that if m is prime, Corollary 1.4 is then a simple consequence of the Cauchy-Davenport-Chowla ineqaulity, which asserts that if A, B, C are subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_p$ for prime p, then

$$|A+B+C| \geq \min(|A|+|B|+|C|-2, p).$$

In the other extreme when m is highly composite, the situation is quite different, as $|A|$ is much smaller than m, and thus one has to use the structure of the set of reduced residues $\mathbb{Z}_m^*$ in $\mathbb{Z}_m$.

Proposition 1.3 will be proved in Section 3. Then in Section 4, we use the transference principle argument to deduce Theorem 1.1. The content of Section 4 is essentially the same as Section 3 of [4]. We include this for the sake of completeness, and we also hope to outline the main ingredients of the transference principle without too much technical details.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Ben Green for suggesting this problem to him. He is also grateful for his advisor, Kannan Soundararajan, for some helpful comments on exposition.

2. Lemmata

Lemma 2.1. *Let $n \geq 6$ be an even positive integer. Let $a_0 \geq a_1 \geq \ldots \geq a_{n-1}$ be a decreasing sequence of numbers in $[0,1]$, and let A denote their average $A =$*

$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} a_j$. *Suppose that for all triples* (i,j,k) *with* $0 \le i,j,k \le n-1$ *and* $i+j+k \ge n$ *we have*

$$a_ia_j + a_ja_k + a_ka_i \le \tfrac{5}{8}(a_i + a_j + a_k).$$

Then the average value A *is bounded by* $\frac{5}{8}$.

Proof. We make the change of variables $x_i = \frac{16}{5}a_i - 1$. Then the variables x_i form a decreasing sequence of numbers in $[-1, 11/5]$. Our condition on the sequence a_i becomes, with a little calculation: for all triples (i,j,k) with $0 \le i,j,k \le n-1$ and $i+j+k \ge n$,

$$x_ix_j + x_jx_k + x_kx_i \le 3. \tag{1}$$

If X denotes the average value $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} x_i = \frac{16}{5}A - 1$, then our goal is to show that $X \le 1$. Suppose instead that $X > 1$, and so in particular $x_0 > 1$.

Write $n = 2m$ so that $m \ge 3$ is an integer, and define

$$S_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i, \qquad \text{and} \qquad S_1 = \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} x_i,$$

so that $S_0 + S_1 = nX > n$. Since $S_0 \le 2.2m$, it follows that $S_1 \ge -0.2m$.

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the set of triples (i,j,k) with $0 \le i,j \le m-1$ and $m \le k \le n-1$ with $i+j+k \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Given i and j there is a unique k with $(i,j,k) \in \mathcal{M}$. Thus $|\mathcal{M}| = m^2$, and note that all triples in $\mathcal{M}$ except for $(0,0,m)$ satisfy $i+j+k \ge 2m = n$. Summing the condition (1) over all triples in $\mathcal{M}$ except for $(0,0,m)$ we get that

$$\sum_{(i,j,k)\in\mathcal{M}} (x_ix_j + x_jx_k + x_kx_i) - (x_0^2 + 2x_0x_m) \le 3(m^2-1).$$

If we fix two of the variables i, j, k (in the appropriate intervals) then the third is uniquely determined by the congruence condition $i+j+k \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Therefore the sum over $(i,j,k) \in \mathcal{M}$ above equals $S_0^2 + 2S_0S_1$, and our inequality above reads

$$S_0^2 + 2S_0S_1 \le 3(m^2-1) + (x_0^2 + 2x_0x_m) \le 3m^2 + (x_0^2 - x_m^2), \tag{2}$$

where the final inequality follows since $x_m^2 + 2x_0x_m \le 3$ using (1) with $(m,m,0)$.

Consider first the case $S_1 \le 0$. Since $S_1 \ge -0.2m$ we conclude from (2) that

$$(S_0+S_1)^2 \le 3m^2 + S_1^2 + (x_0^2 - x_m^2) \le 3m^2 + (0.2m)^2 + (2.2)^2 < 4m^2,$$

since $m \ge 3$. It follows that $S_0 + S_1 \le 2m$, contradicting our assumption that $X > 1$.

It remains to consider the case $S_1 > 0$. We must then have $x_m \ge 0$, and note that $S_1 \le mx_m$. Therefore (2) yields

$$4m^2 < (S_0+S_1)^2 \le 3m^2 + m^2x_m^2 + x_0^2 - x_m^2,$$

and upon rearranging we have

$$x_0^2 > 1 + (m^2-1)(1-x_m^2). \tag{3}$$

But the condition $x_m^2 + 2x_0x_m \le 3$ implies that $x_0x_m \le 1 + (1-x_m^2)/2$, and upon squaring that $x_0^2x_m^2 \le 1 + (1-x_m^2) + (1-x_m^2)^2/4$. Combining this with the lower bound (3), and note that $x_m^2 \le 1$ by (1) with (m,m,m), we conclude that $x_m^2 < 9/(4m^2-3)$. but when this is entered into (3) we obtain a contradiction to $x_0 \le 2.2$. $\square$

We remark that the constant $5/8$ appearing in the statement can be replaced by an arbitrary $\alpha \in (0,1)$, with the condition $n \geq 6$ replaced by $n \geq N(\alpha)$ for some constant $N(\alpha)$ depending on α. For a fixed α, one can work out exactly what $N(\alpha)$ is, by following the above argument in the proof. We will only be concerned with the case $\alpha = 5/8$, though.

Note that Lemma 2.1 fails for $n = 4$. For example, we may take $a_0 = 1$, $a_1 = 0.6$, $a_2 = 0.5$, and $a_3 = 0.41$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $n \geq 10$ be an even positive integer. Let $\{a_i\}, \{b_i\}, \{c_i\}$ $(0 \leq i < n)$ be three decreasing sequences of reals in $[0,1]$. Let A, B, C denote the averages of a_i, b_i, c_i, respectively. Suppose that for all triples (i,j,k) with $0 \leq i,j,k < n$ and $i+j+k \geq n$ we have*

$$a_ib_j + b_jc_k + c_ka_i \leq \tfrac{5}{8}(a_i + b_j + c_k).$$

Then

$$AB + BC + CA \leq \tfrac{5}{8}(A + B + C).$$

This is simply an asymmetric version of Lemma 2.1. It is needed to complete the induction process of proving Proposition 1.3. The heart of the proof of Lemma 2.2 is similar as that of Lemma 2.1: we deduce from the hypotheses an inequality such as (2), and proceed from there by dividing into cases. Unfortunately, there are many more cases to consider in the asymmetric version.

Proof. As before, we make the change of variables $x_i = \frac{16}{5}a_i - 1$, $y_i = \frac{16}{5}b_i - 1$, and $z_i = \frac{16}{5}c_i - 1$. Then $\{x_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$, and $\{z_i\}$ form decreasing sequences of reals in $[-1, 2.2]$. By hypothesis, for all triples (i,j,k) with $0 \leq i,j,k < n$ and $i+j+k \geq n$,

$$x_iy_j + y_jz_k + z_kx_i \leq 3. \tag{4}$$

If X, Y, Z denote the averages of x_i, y_i, z_i, respectively, then our goal becomes to show that

$$XY + YZ + ZX \leq 3.$$

Write $n = 2m$ and define

$$X_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x_i, X_1 = \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} x_i, Y_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} y_i, Y_1 = \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} y_i, Z_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} z_i, Z_1 = \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} z_i.$$

Let $\mathcal{M}$ denote the set of triples (i,j,k) with $0 \leq i,j \leq m-1, m \leq k \leq n-1$ and $i+j+k \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Just as before, we sum the condition (4) over all triples (i,j,k) in $\mathcal{M}$ except for $(0,0,m)$ to get

$$\sum_{(i,j,k)\in\mathcal{M}} (x_iy_j + y_jz_k + z_kx_i) - (x_0y_0 + y_0z_m + z_mx_0) \leq 3(m^2-1).$$

Again, if two of the variables i,j,k are fixed, then the third is uniquely determined by the congruence condition $i+j+k \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$. Hence the sum over $(i,j,k) \in \mathcal{M}$ above equals $X_0Y_0 + Y_0Z_1 + Z_1X_0$, and our inequality reads

$$X_0Y_0 + Y_0Z_1 + Z_1X_0 \leq 3(m^2-1) + (x_0y_0 + y_0z_m + z_mx_0).$$

Similarly, we have the other two inequalities

$$X_0Y_1 + Y_1Z_0 + Z_0X_0 \leq 3(m^2-1) + (x_0y_m + y_mz_0 + z_0x_0),$$

$$X_1Y_0 + Y_0Z_0 + Z_0X_1 \leq 3(m^2-1) + (x_my_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_m).$$

Using the above three inequalities, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&n^2(XY+YZ+ZX)\\&=(X_0+X_1)(Y_0+Y_1)+(Y_0+Y_1)(Z_0+Z_1)+(Z_0+Z_1)(X_0+X_1)\\&\le 9(m^2-1)+(x_0y_0+y_0z_m+z_mx_0)+(x_0y_m+y_mz_0+z_0x_0)\\&\quad+(x_my_0+y_0z_0+z_0x_m)+(X_1Y_1+Y_1Z_1+Z_1X_1)\\&=9(m^2-1)+U+V-W,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}U&=(x_0+x_m)(y_0+y_m)+(y_0+y_m)(z_0+z_m)+(z_0+z_m)(x_0+x_m),\\V&=X_1Y_1+Y_1Z_1+Z_1X_1,\\W&=x_my_m+y_mz_m+z_mx_m.\end{aligned}$$

In order to prove that $XY+YZ+ZX\le 3$, it suffices to prove that

$$U+V-W\le 3m^2+9. \tag{5}$$

By summing over the condition (4) over all triples (i,j,k) with $m\le i,j,k<n$ and $i+j+k\equiv 0 \pmod m$, except for (m,m,m), we conclude that

$$V-W\le 3(m^2-1). \tag{6}$$

Now we consider U. For convenience, write $r=x_0+x_m$, $s=y_0+y_m$, and $t=z_0+z_m$. Then $r,s,t\in[-2,4.4]$, and

$$U=rs+st+tr.$$

Consider the three numbers $r+s$, $s+t$, and $t+r$. If at least one of them is negative, say $r+s<0$, then

$$U=(r+s)t+rs\le rs-2(r+s)=(r-2)(s-2)-4\le(-4)\cdot(-4)-4=12,$$

and this gives (5) upon using (6). Hence we may assume that $r+s$, $s+t$, and $t+r$ are all nonnegative. This implies that U is an increasing function of each of its variables r, s, and t.

We now bound V in terms of x_m, y_m, and z_m. By the monotonicity of $\{x_i\}$, $\{y_i\}$, and $\{z_i\}$, together with the fact that $x_i,y_i,z_i\ge -1$, we have

$$x_m-(m-1)\le X_1\le mx_m,\quad y_m-(m-1)\le Y_1\le my_m,\quad z_m-(m-1)\le Z_1\le mz_m.$$

We consider four cases, depending on the signs of X_1, Y_1, and Z_1.

Case (i): If $X_1,Y_1,Z_1<0$, then V is decreasing in each of its variables X_1,Y_1,Z_1, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}V&\le[x_m-(m-1)][y_m-(m-1)]+[y_m-(m-1)][z_m-(m-1)]+\\&\quad+[z_m-(m-1)][x_m-(m-1)]\\&=3(m-1)^2-2(m-1)(x_m+y_m+z_m)+W.\end{aligned}$$

We use the following trivial estimate for U (recall that, under our assumption, U is an increasing function of r,s,t):

$$\begin{aligned}U&\le(2.2+x_m)(2.2+y_m)+(2.2+y_m)(2.2+z_m)+(2.2+z_m)(2.2+x_m)\\&=14.52+4.4(x_m+y_m+z_m)+W.\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above bounds for U and V, we get

$$\begin{aligned}U+V-W &\leq 14.52+3(m-1)^2+(x_my_m+y_mz_m+z_mx_m)-(2m-6.4)(x_m+y_m+z_m)\\ &= 14.52+3(m-1)^2-3(m-3.2)^2+(x_m-m+3.2)(y_m-m+3.2)+\\ &\quad+(y_m-m+3.2)(z_m-m+3.2)+(z_m-m+3.2)(x_m-m+3.2).\end{aligned}$$

Since $x_m-m+3.2, y_m-m+3.2, z_m-m+3.2 \in [2.2-m, 5.4-m]$ and $m \geq 4$, the right side above attains its maximum when $x_m = y_m = z_m = -1$. Hence,

$$U+V-W \leq 3m^2+1.32,$$

thus confirming (5).

Case (ii): If exactly two of X_1, Y_1, Z_1 are negative, say $X_1, Y_1 < 0$ and $Z_1 \geq 0$, then we have $V \leq X_1Y_1 \leq m^2$ because $X_1, Y_1 \in [-m, 0)$. For $U-W$, after expanding out, we can write $U-W$ as sum of nine terms, and each term is bounded above by 2.2^2. Hence $U-W \leq 9 \cdot 2.2^2$. Combining the above bounds for V and $U-W$, and recalling that $m \geq 5$, one gets (5) after some simple computations.

Case (iii): If exactly one of X_1, Y_1, Z_1 is negative, say $X_1 < 0$ and $Y_1, Z_1 \geq 0$, and either X_1+Y_1 or X_1+Z_1 is negative, say $X_1+Y_1 < 0$, then we have $V = (X_1+Y_1)Z_1 + X_1Y_1 \leq 0$. The rest follows as in Case (ii).

Case (iv): We are now left with the case that X_1+Y_1, Y_1+Z_1, and X_1+Z_1 are all non-negative. In particular, we have $x_m+y_m \geq 0$, $y_m+z_m \geq 0$, and $z_m+x_m \geq 0$. Under this assumption, V is an increasing function of X_1, Y_1, and Z_1, and thus

$$V \leq m^2(x_my_m+y_mz_m+z_mx_m) = m^2W. \tag{7}$$

By (4) applied to $(0,m,m), (m,0,m), (m,m,0)$,

$$x_0y_m+y_mz_m+z_mx_0 \leq 3, \quad x_my_0+y_0z_m+z_mx_m \leq 3, \quad x_my_m+y_mz_0+z_0x_m \leq 3.$$

Summing the above three inequalities we get

$$W+x_0y_m+x_0z_m+y_0x_m+y_0z_m+z_0x_m+z_0y_m \leq 9, \tag{8}$$

and this is equivalent to

$$U \leq 9+(x_0y_0+y_0z_0+z_0x_0). \tag{9}$$

We first assume that

$$x_m+y_m \geq 0.55, \quad y_m+z_m \geq 0.55, \quad z_m+x_m \geq 0.55.$$

This implies that $x_0+y_0-8(x_m+y_m) \leq 4.4-8\times 0.55 = 0$, and thus

$$[x_0+y_0-8(x_m+y_m)](z_0-z_m) \leq 0,$$

and upon expanding we have

$$(x_0z_0+y_0z_0)+8(x_mz_m+y_mz_m) \leq x_0z_m+y_0z_m+8(x_mz_0+y_mz_0).$$

Similarly, we have the other two inequalities

$$(y_0x_0+z_0x_0)+8(y_mx_m+z_mx_m) \leq y_0x_m+z_0x_m+8(y_mx_0+z_mx_0),$$

$$(z_0y_0+x_0y_0)+8(z_my_m+x_my_m) \leq z_0y_m+x_0y_m+8(z_my_0+x_my_0).$$

Suming the above three inequalities, we get

$$2(x_0y_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_0) + 16W \le 9(x_0y_m + x_0z_m + y_0x_m + y_0z_m + z_0x_m + z_0y_m),$$

and by (8), we then have

$$2(x_0y_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_0) + 25W \le 81. \tag{10}$$

Combining (7), (9), and (10), we get

$$\begin{aligned} U + V - W &\le 9 + (x_0y_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_0) + (m^2 - 1)W \\ &\le 9 + \tfrac{81}{2} + \left(m^2 - \tfrac{27}{2}\right) W \\ &\le 9 + \tfrac{81}{2} + 3\left(m^2 - \tfrac{27}{2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

since $W \le 3$ by (4) and $m \ge 5$. This gives (5).

It only remains to consider the case when at least one of $x_m + y_m$, $y_m + z_m$, and $z_m + x_m$ is less than 0.55, say $x_m + y_m < 0.55$. Since $x_m + y_m \ge 0$ under our assumption, we have $x_my_m < (0.55/2)^2$, and thus

$$W = z_m(x_m + y_m) + x_my_m \le 2.2 \times 0.55 + \left(\tfrac{0.55}{2}\right)^2 < 1.3.$$

Upon using (7) and (9), we then have

$$U + V - W \le 9 + (x_0y_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_0) + 1.3(m^2 - 1).$$

Inserting the trivial bound $x_0y_0 + y_0z_0 + z_0x_0 \le 3 \cdot 2.2^2$ above, we get (5) when $m \ge 5$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Numerical experiments show that both Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 should be true for $n \ge 6$. However, in order to deal with the case $n = 6$ in Lemma 2.2, the treatment of several cases seems to be more delicate. Fortunately, the combination of these two lemmas as stated would suffice for our purpose, and we thus do not pursue the optimal statement for Lemma 2.2.

Finally, we state without proof a simple version of Corollay 1.4 when $m = 15$, which can be checked by a computer program.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $A, B, C \subset \mathbb{Z}_{15}^*$ be three arbitrary subsets. Suppose that*

$$|A||B| + |B||C| + |C||A| > 5(|A| + |B| + |C|).$$

Then $A + B + C = \mathbb{Z}_{15}$.

3. LOCAL RESULTS

Proposition 1.3 follows from Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.1. *Let m be a squarefree positive integer with $(m, 30) = 1$. Let $f : \mathbb{Z}_m^* \to [0, 1]$ be an arbitrary function with average larger than $5/8$:*

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_m^*} f(x) > \tfrac{5}{8}\phi(m).$$

Then for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_m$, there exists $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_m^*$ with $x = a + b + c$, such that

$$f(a)f(b) + f(b)f(c) + f(c)f(a) > \tfrac{5}{8}(f(a) + f(b) + f(c)). \tag{11}$$

Note that the conclusion (11) above implies automatically that $f(a)f(b)f(c) > 0$.

Proof. We proceed by induction. First consider the base case when $m = p \geq 7$ is prime. Let $a_0 \geq a_1 \geq \cdots \geq a_{p-2}$ be the $p-1$ values of $f(x)$ $(x \in \mathbb{F}_p^*)$ in decreasing order. The average of the sequence $\{a_i\}$ is larger than 5/8 by hypothesis. By Lemma 2.1 applied to the sequence $\{a_i\}$ of length $p-1 \geq 6$, we conclude that there exists $0 \leq i, j, k \leq p-2$ with $i+j+k \geq p-1$ such that

$$a_ia_j + a_ja_k + a_ka_i > \tfrac{5}{8}(a_i + a_j + a_k). \tag{12}$$

Define $I, J, K \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ by

$$I = \{x : f(x) \geq a_i\}, \quad J = \{x : f(x) \geq a_j\}, \quad K = \{x : f(x) \geq a_k\}.$$

By the monotonicity of the sequence $\{a_i\}$,

$$|I| + |J| + |K| \geq (i+1) + (j+1) + (k+1) \geq p+2,$$

and thus by the Cauchy-Davenport-Chowla theorem,

$$I + J + K = \mathbb{F}_p.$$

For any $x \in \mathbb{F}_p$, we can thus find $u \in I, v \in J, w \in K$ with $x = u+v+w$. By the definitino of I, J, K, we have

$$f(u) \geq a_i, \quad f(v) \geq a_j, \quad f(w) \geq a_k.$$

It then easily follows from (12) that

$$f(u)f(v) + f(v)f(w) + f(w)f(u) > \tfrac{5}{8}(f(u) + f(v) + f(w)).$$

We now assume that m is composite and write $m = m'p$ with $p \geq 11$. We use the canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}_m \cong \mathbb{Z}_{m'} \times \mathbb{F}_p$ to define $f' : \mathbb{Z}_{m'}^* \to [0,1]$ by

$$f'(x) = \frac{1}{p-1} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_p^*} f(x,y).$$

Then by induction hypothesis, for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{m'}$, there exists $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_{m'}^*$ with $x = a+b+c$, such that

$$f'(a)f'(b) + f'(b)f'(c) + f'(c)f'(a) > \tfrac{5}{8}(f'(a) + f'(b) + f'(c)).$$

Let $a_0 \geq a_1 \geq \cdots \geq a_{p-2}$ be the $p-1$ values of $f(a,x)$ $(x \in \mathbb{F}_p^*)$ in decreasing order. Define similarly the sequences $\{b_i\}$ and $\{c_i\}$. The averages of the sequences $\{a_i\}, \{b_i\}, \{c_i\}$ are $f'(a), f'(b), f'(c)$, respectively. Hence by Lemma 2.2 applied to the sequences $\{a_i\}$, $\{b_i\}$, and $\{c_i\}$ of length $p-1 \geq 10$, we conclude that there exists $0 \leq i, j, k \leq p-2$ with $i+j+k \geq p-1$, such that

$$a_ib_j + b_jc_k + c_ka_i > \tfrac{5}{8}(a_i + b_j + c_k). \tag{13}$$

Define $I, J, K \subset \mathbb{F}_p^*$ by

$$I = \{x : f(a,x) \geq a_i\}, \quad J = \{x : f(b,x) \geq b_j\}, \quad K = \{x : f(c,x) \geq c_k\}.$$

By the monotonicity of the sequences $\{a_i\}$, $\{b_i\}$, and $\{c_i\}$,

$$|I| + |J| + |K| \geq (i+1) + (j+1) + (k+1) \geq p+2,$$

and thus by the Cauchy-Davenport-Chowla theorem,

$$I + J + K = \mathbb{F}_p.$$

For any $y \in \mathbb{F}_p$, we can thus find $u \in I, v \in J, w \in K$ with $y = u+v+w$. By the definitions of I, J, K, we have

$$f(a,u) \geq a_i, \quad f(b,v) \geq b_j, \quad f(c,w) \geq c_k.$$

It then follows easily from (13) that

$$f(a,u)f(b,v)+f(b,v)f(c,w)+f(c,w)f(a,u)>\tfrac{5}{8}(f(a,u)+f(b,v)+f(c,w)).$$

This completes the induction step. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let $f_1,f_2,f_3:\mathbb{Z}_{15}^*\to[0,1]$ be arbitrary functions. Let*

$$F_i=\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_{15}^*}f_i(x).$$

Suppose that

$$F_1F_2+F_2F_3+F_3F_1>5(F_1+F_2+F_3). \tag{14}$$

Then for any $x\in\mathbb{Z}_{15}$, there exists $a,b,c\in\mathbb{Z}_{15}^*$ with $x=a+b+c$, such that

$$f_1(a)f_2(b)f_3(c)>0,\quad f_1(a)+f_2(b)+f_3(c)>\tfrac{3}{2}.$$

Proof. Our proof is based on case by case analysis. Let A_i be the support of f_i ($A_i=\{x\in\mathbb{Z}_{15}^*:f_i(x)>0\}$) and write $a_i=|A_i|$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a_1\le a_2\le a_3$. Since $a_i\ge F_i$, we have by (14),

$$a_1a_2+a_2a_3+a_3a_1>5(a_1+a_2+a_3). \tag{15}$$

Let M be the set of all possible (a_1,a_2,a_3) satisfying (15). Since $a_1,a_2,a_3\in\{0,1,\dots,8\}$, it turns out that $|M|=34$. For each fixed (a_1,a_2,a_3), let $x_{i1}\ge x_{i2}\ge\cdots\ge x_{ia_i}$ be the nonzero values of f_i. We shall assume, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$x_{1j_1}+x_{2j_2}+x_{3j_3}\le\tfrac{3}{2}, \tag{16}$$

for all triples (j_1,j_2,j_3) satisfying

$$1\le j_i\le a_i,\quad j_1j_2+j_2j_3+j_3j_1>5(j_1+j_2+j_3). \tag{17}$$

(In fact, if there exists j_1,j_2,j_3 with (17) such that $x_{1j_1}+x_{2j_2}+x_{3j_3}>3/2$, then we are done in view of Lemma 2.3). For each (a_1,a_2,a_3), we set up an optimization problem with variables $x_{ij}\in[0,1]$ ($1\le j\le a_i$), and constraints (16) for all triples (j_1,j_2,j_3) satisfying (17). Our objective is to maximize the sum of all variables:

$$S=\sum_{i=1}^{3}\sum_{j=1}^{a_i}x_{ij}=F_1+F_2+F_3.$$

The constraints and the objective function in this optimization problem are all linear, and the maximum of S can be found using a linear programming algorithm. Our conclusion is the following:

$$F_1+F_2+F_3\le\begin{cases}16 & (a_1,a_2,a_3)=(2,8,8),\\ 15.5 & (a_1,a_2,a_3)\in M_1,\\ 15 & \text{otherwise,}\end{cases}$$

where

$$M_1=\{(2,7,8),(3,6,8),(3,8,8),(4,5,8),(4,8,8)\}.$$

Hence, for $(a_1,a_2,a_3)\notin M_1$ and $(a_1,a_2,a_3)\ne(2,8,8)$, we have $F_1+F_2+F_3\le15$, from which one easily gets a contradiction with (14):

$$F_1F_2+F_2F_3+F_3F_1\le\tfrac{1}{3}(F_1+F_2+F_3)^2\le5(F_1+F_2+F_3). \tag{18}$$

Now we consider the remaining cases. For notational convenience, we shall write

$$T(x, y, z) = xy + yz + zx - 5(x + y + z).$$

By (14), $T(F_1, F_2, F_3) > 0$, and it is easy to see that $T(x, y, z)$ is an increasing function of x, y, z in the range $x \geq F_1$, $y \geq F_2$, $z \geq F_3$. We aim for a contradiction in each case.

For $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \{(2, 7, 8), (2, 8, 8)\}$, we have $F_1 + F_2 + F_3 \leq 16$ and $F_1 \leq 2$, and thus

$$T(F_1, F_2, F_3) \leq T(2, 7, 7) < 0.$$

For $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \{(3, 6, 8), (3, 8, 8)\}$, we have $F_1 + F_2 + F_3 \leq 15.5$ and $F_1 \leq 3$, and thus

$$T(F_1, F_2, F_3) \leq T(3, 6.25, 6.25) < 0.$$

For $(a_1, a_2, a_3) = (4, 5, 8)$, we divide into two possibilities: $F_1 + F_2 \geq 8$ and $F_1 + F_2 \leq 8$. If $F_1 + F_2 \geq 8$, we solve the optimization problem as before, but with the additional constraint given by $F_1 + F_2 \geq 8$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{a_i} x_{ij} \geq 8,$$

to conclude that $S \leq 15$, and we are done by (18). If $F_1 + F_2 \leq 8$, we then have

$$T(F_1, F_2, F_3) \leq T(4, 4, 7.5) < 0.$$

Finally, for $(a_1, a_2, a_3) = (4, 8, 8)$, we again divide into two possibilities: $F_1 \geq 3$ and $F_1 \leq 3$. If $F_1 \geq 3$, we solve the optimization problem as before, but with the additional constraint given by $F_1 \geq 3$:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{a_1} x_{1j} \geq 3,$$

to conclude that $S \leq 15$, and we are done by (18). If $F_1 \leq 3$, then, as in the case $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \{(3, 6, 8), (3, 8, 8)\}$, we have

$$T(F_1, F_2, F_3) \leq T(3, 6.25, 6.25) < 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. First note that if the result holds for m, then it also holds for any m' dividing m. Hence we may assume that $15|m$. Write $m = 15m'$, where $(m', 30) = 1$. We shall use the canonical isomorphism $\mathbb{Z}_m \cong \mathbb{Z}_{m'} \times \mathbb{Z}_{15}$. Let $(u, v) \in \mathbb{Z}_m$ be arbitrary ($u \in \mathbb{Z}_{m'}$, $v \in \mathbb{Z}_{15}$). Define $f' : \mathbb{Z}_{m'} \to [0, 1]$ by

$$f'(x) = \frac{1}{\phi(15)} \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_{15}^*} f(x, y).$$

Since the average of f is larger than $5/8$, so is the average of f'. We may apply Proposition 3.1 to f', concluding that there exists $a_1, a_2, a_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{m'}^*$ with $u = a_1 + a_2 + a_3$, such that

$$f'(a_1)f'(a_2) + f'(a_2)f'(a_3) + f'(a_3)f'(a_1) > \tfrac{5}{8}(f'(a_1) + f'(a_2) + f'(a_3)). \tag{19}$$

Now define $f_i : \mathbb{Z}_{15}^* \to [0, 1]$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) by

$$f_i(y) = f(a_i, y).$$

Note that (19) implies that the hypothesis of Proposition 3.2 holds for f_1, f_2, f_3, and we can conclude that there exists $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{15}^*$ with $v = b_1 + b_2 + b_3$, such that

$$f_i(b_i) > 0, \quad f_1(b_1) + f_2(b_2) + f_3(b_3) > \tfrac{3}{2}.$$

Equivalently, we have $(u, v) = (a_1, b_1) + (a_2, b_2) + (a_3, b_3)$, and

$$f(a_i, b_i) > 0, \quad f(a_1, b_1) + f(a_2, b_2) + f(a_3, b_3) > \tfrac{3}{2}.$$

This completes the proof. □

4. Proof of Theorem 1.1

4.1. **The transference principle.** In this section, we work in $\mathbb{Z}_N = \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. For a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_N \to \mathbb{C}$, its Fourier transform is defined by

$$\hat{f}(r) = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N} f(x) e_N(rx), \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_N,$$

where $e_N(y) = \exp(2\pi i y/N)$ as usual.

The convolution of two functions $f, g : \mathbb{Z}_N \to \mathbb{C}$ is defined by

$$f * g(x) = \sum_{y \in \mathbb{Z}_N} f(y) g(x - y)$$

for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let N be a sufficiently large prime. Suppose that $\mu_i : \mathbb{Z}_N \to \mathbb{R}^+$ and $a_i : \mathbb{Z}_N \to \mathbb{R}^+$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are functions satisfying the majorization condition*

$$0 \le a_i(n) \le \mu_i(n), \tag{20}$$

and the mean condition

$$\min(\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_3 - 1) \ge \delta \tag{21}$$

for some small $\delta > 0$, where $\delta_i = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N} a_i(x)$. Suppose that μ_i and a_i also satisfiy the pseudorandomness conditions

$$|\hat{\mu_i}(r) - \delta_{r,0}| = o(1) \tag{22}$$

for all $r \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, where $\delta_{r,0}$ is the Kronecker delta, and

$$\|\hat{a_i}\|_q = \left(\sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}_N} |\hat{a_i}(r)|^q \right)^{1/q} = O(1) \tag{23}$$

for some $2 < q < 3$. Then for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, we have

$$\sum_{y, z \in \mathbb{Z}_N} a_1(y) a_2(z) a_3(x - y - z) \ge \frac{c(\delta)}{N}, \tag{24}$$

where $c(\delta) > 0$ is a constant depending only on δ.

We first outline the proof. The first ingredient is to write a_i as the sum $a_i' + a_i''$, where the function a_i' is set-like, in the sense that it resembles the normalized characteristic function of a dense subset of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ (with density δ_i), and the function f_i'' is uniform, in the sense that it has small Fourier coefficients. The second ingredient is to write the quantity in (24) in terms of the Fourier coefficients of a_i, and to prove that one can replace a_i by a_i' at the cost of a small error term. The last step is to prove the corresponding result for a_i'. As a_i' is set-like, this is essentially (a quantitative version of) the Cauchy-Davenport theorem.

We now carry out the details. We construct a_i' as follows. Let $\epsilon = \epsilon(N) > 0$ be a parameter that goes to zero very slowly as $N \to \infty$. Define

$$R = \{r \in \mathbb{Z}_N : |\hat{a}_i(r)| \geq \epsilon\}.$$

Define a Bohr set B by

$$B = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N : |e_N(xr) - 1| \leq \epsilon, r \in R\}.$$

Let β be the normalized characteristic function of B:

$$\beta = \frac{\mathbf{1}_B}{|B|}.$$

Let

$$a_i' = a_i * \beta * \beta, \quad a_i'' = a_i - a_i'.$$

We record the desired properties of a_i' and a_i''.

Lemma 4.2. *The functions a_i' and a_i'' constructed above satisfy the following conditions:*

1. $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N} a_i'(x) = \delta_i$.
2. *(a_i' is set-like)* $0 \leq a_i' \leq (1 + o_\epsilon(1))/N$.
3. *(a_i'' is uniform)* $\|\hat{a_i''}\|_\infty \ll \epsilon$.
4. $\|\hat{a_i'}\|_q = O(1)$ *and* $\|\hat{a_i''}\|_q \leq= O(1)$.

Proof. See Proposition 5.1 of [2]. □

We now consider the quantity in (24), and show that the function a_i there can be replaced by a_i' at the cost of a small error term.

Lemma 4.3. *With a_i' defined as above, we have, for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$,*

$$\left| \sum_{y,z} a_i(y)a_i(z)a_i(x-y-z) - \sum_{y,z} a_i'(y)a_i'(z)a_i'(x-y-z) \right| \ll \frac{\epsilon^{3-q}}{N}.$$

Proof. Since $a_i = a_i' + a_i''$, the left side above is bounded by the sum of seven terms of the form

$$S(f,g,h) = \left| \sum_{y,z} f(y)g(z)h(x-y-z) \right|,$$

where $f,g,h \in \{a_i', a_i''\}$ and $(f,g,h) \neq (a_i', a_i', a_i')$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $h = a_i''$. We have

$$S(f,g,h) = \frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_r \hat{f}(r)\hat{g}(r)\hat{h}(r)e_N(rx) \right| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_r |\hat{f}(r)\hat{g}(r)\hat{h}(r)|.$$

By Lemma 4.2 (3), we have $|\hat{h}(r)| \ll \epsilon$. Hence,

$$S(f,g,h) \ll N^{-1}\epsilon^{3-q} \sum_r |\hat{f}(r)\hat{g}(r)\hat{h}(r)^{q-2}|.$$

Now by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 4.2 (4),

$$S(f,g,h) \ll N^{-1}\epsilon^{3-q} \|\hat{f}\|_q \|\hat{g}\|_q \|\hat{h}\|_q^{q-2} \ll N^{-1}\epsilon^{3-q}.$$

□

We now treat the set-like function a'_i. Let

$$X_i = \{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N : a'_i(x) \geq \delta^2/N\}.$$

Then

$$\delta_i = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}_N} a'_i(x) \leq (1 + o_\epsilon(1))\frac{|X_i|}{N} + \delta^2.$$

Hence,

$$|X_i| \geq (1 - o_\epsilon(1))(\delta_i - \delta^2)N.$$

By choosing ϵ going to 0 slowly enough, we can ensure that $o_\epsilon(1)$ above is $o(1)$, and thus for N sufficiently large,

$$\min(|X_1|, |X_2|, |X_3|, |X_1| + |X_2| + |X_3| - N) \geq \tfrac{\delta N}{2}.$$

The problem is now reduced to proving that $X_1 + X_2 + X_3 = \mathbb{Z}_N$, and that each element of $\mathbb{Z}_N$ can be written in many ways as $x_1 + x_2 + x_3$ ($x_i \in X_i$).

Lemma 4.4. *Let $X_1, X_2, X_3 \subset \mathbb{Z}_N$. Let $\theta_i = |X_i|/N$. Suppose that*

$$\theta = \min(\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3, \theta_1 + \theta_2 + \theta_3 - 1) > 0.$$

Theree exists $N(\theta)$ and $c(\theta) > 0$, such that if $N \geq N(\theta)$, then for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, there are at least $c(\theta)N^2$ ways to write $x = x_1 + x_2 + x_3$ with $x_i \in X_i$.

Proof. See Lemma 3.3 of [4]. □

It follows that for any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_N$,

$$\sum_{y,z} a'_i(y)a'_i(z)a'_i(x - y - z) \geq \frac{\delta^6}{N^3} \sum_{y \in X_1, z \in X_2, x-y-z \in X_3} 1 \geq \frac{c(\delta)}{N},$$

where $c(\delta) > 0$ depends only on δ. This proves (24) in view of Lemma 4.3.

4.2. **Deduction of Theorem 1.1.** We now use Proposition 1.3 and Proposition 4.1 to deduce Theorem 1.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be odd and sufficiently large. We wish to show that $n \in A + A + A$. We may assume that

$$\left| A \cap \left[1, \frac{2n}{3}\right) \right| > \left(\frac{5}{8} + \delta\right) \frac{2n}{3 \log n},$$

for some small $\delta > 0$.

In order for the transference principle to be applicable, one needs to find a pseudorandom majorant μ for the characteristic function of A. The naive choice of μ is the characteristic function of the primes, but unfortunately it is not pseudorandom because the set of primes are not equidistributed in residue classes. To remove this issue, we use the so-called "W-trick".

Let $z = \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \log\log n \rfloor$ and $W = \prod_{p \leq z} p$, where the product is over primes. Define a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_W^* \to [0, 1]$ by

$$f(b) = \max\left(\frac{3\phi(W)}{2n} \sum_{x \in A \cap (W\mathbb{Z} + b), x < 2n/3} \log x - c, 0\right)$$

for some small $c > 0$. Then by the prime number theorem, it is not hard to see that $f(b) \in [0, 1]$ and that the average of f is larger than $5/8 + \delta/2$, provided that c is small enough and n is large enough depending on δ.

We can thus apply Proposition 1.3 to conclude that there exists $b_1, b_2, b_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_W^*$ with

$$f(b_1)f(b_2)f(b_3) > 0, \quad f(b_1) + f(b_2) + f(b_3) > \tfrac{3}{2}. \tag{25}$$

Let

$$A_i = \left\{ \frac{x - b_i}{W} : x \in A \cap (W\mathbb{Z} + b_i), x < \frac{2n}{3} \right\}.$$

Our goal becomes to prove that

$$\frac{n - b_1 - b_2 - b_3}{W} \in A_1 + A_2 + A_3.$$

We pick a prime $N \in [(1+\kappa)n/W, (1+2\kappa)n/W]$, where $\kappa > 0$ is small. By the choice of N, it is easy to see that it sufficies to show that $(n-b_1-b_2-b_3)/W \in A_1+A_2+A_3$ when A_1, A_2, A_3 are considered as subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_N$. From now on, we view A_1, A_2, A_3 as subsets of $\mathbb{Z}_N$, and we shall prove that

$$A_1 + A_2 + A_3 = \mathbb{Z}_N.$$

We have now completed the W-trick: there are no local obstructions for A_1, A_2, A_3 to be pseudorandom.

For $x \in [0, N-1]$, define

$$\mu_i(x) = \begin{cases} \phi(W)\log(Wx + b_i)/(WN) & \text{if } Wx + b_i \text{ is prime,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $a_i(x) = 1_{A_i}(x)\mu_i(x)$. We then have the majorization condition

$$0 \leq a_i(x) \leq \mu_i(x).$$

The sum of $a_i(x)$ is

$$\delta_i = \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} a_i(x) = \frac{\phi(W)}{WN} \sum_{x \in A \cap (W\mathbb{Z}+b_i), x < 2n/3} \log x = \frac{2n}{3WN}(f(b_i) + c).$$

By choosing κ small enough (depending on c), we then have

$$\delta_i \geq \tfrac{2}{3} f(b_i) + \tfrac{c}{3}.$$

Hence by (25),

$$\delta_i \geq \tfrac{c}{3}, \quad \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_3 \geq 1 + c,$$

This confirms the mean condition (21).

Lemma 4.5 (Pseudorandom majorant). *Suppose that N and $W = \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \log\log N \rfloor$ are sufficiently large. Then*

$$\sup_{r \neq 0} |\hat{\mu_i}(r)| \leq \frac{2 \log\log W}{W}.$$

Proof. See Lemma 6.2 of [1]. □

This gives (22) when $r \neq 0$. The case $r = 0$ follows from the prime number theorem.

Lemma 4.6 (Discrete majorant property). *Suppose that $q > 2$. Then there is an absolute constant $C(q)$ such that*

$$\sum_r |\hat{a_i}(r)|^q \leq C(q).$$

Proof. See Lemma 6.6 of [1]. □

The transference principle, Proposition 4.1, thus applies to give

$$\sum_{y,z\in\mathbb{Z}_N} a_1(y)a_2(z)a_3(x-y-z) > 0.$$

This proves that $A_1 + A_2 + A_3 = \mathbb{Z}_N$.

REFERENCES

[1] B. Green. Roth's theorem in the primes. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 1609–1636, 2005.

[2] B. Green and T. Tao. Restriction theory of the selberg sieve, with applications. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux*, 18:147–182, 2006.

[3] H. A. Helfgott. Minor arcs for goldbach's problem. *Arxiv preprint arXiv:1205.5252*, 2012.

[4] H. Li and H. Pan. A density version of vinogradov's three primes theorem. *Forum Mathematicum*, 22:699–714, 2010.

[5] I. M. Vinogradov. The representation of an odd number as a sum of three primes. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR.*, 16:139–142, 1937.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, 450 SERRA MALL, BLDG. 380, STANFORD, CA 94305-2125

E-mail address: `xshao@math.stanford.edu`